

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-12, 14-18 and 20-22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 2, 13 and 19 are canceled and claims 1, 8, 12 and 18 are amended. No new matter is added.

The attached Appendix includes marked-up copies of each rewritten claim (37 C.F.R. §1.121(c)(1)(ii)).

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Claim 8 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,012,083 to Savitzky et al. (hereinafter "Savitzky"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Savitzky fails to disclose or suggest the step of automatically activating a communication browser program in the computer upon selection of the print command, as recited in claim 1.

Savitzky discloses a printer agency 60 used to provide a document-centric interface to a printer 62 when the user requests, via browser 64, that an HTML document 66 is to be printed (col. 12, line 66 - col. 13, line 14). However, Savitzky fails to disclose or even mention that the browser 64 is automatically activated once the print command is selected. In fact, Savitzky discloses that the user must call each interested agent to add new transaction, modify existing transaction, or add a hook to a transaction handle queue (col. 14, lines 49-53 and Fig. 7). Thus, Savitzky fails to disclose or suggest the step of automatically activating a

communication browser program in the computer upon selection of the print command, as recited in claim 1.

Claims 12-13, 16-19 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,134,568 to Tonkin. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Tonkin fails to disclose or suggest a second module to automatically launch a communications browser module upon a selection of the Internet print request to access a server associated with a service bureau at a predefined address, as recited in claims 12 and 18.

Tonkin merely discloses terminals 31, 32 communicating with internet service providers (ISPs) 41, 42 through the internet backbone 50 by the processing facility 60. The processing facility 60 retrieves documents order messages sent over the internet, process those orders, and then distribute them to one of the various document production locations (col. 3, lines 57-61). That is, the terminal user must submit the print command to the computer and interface with the document production location manually, rather than one of the software modules automatically launching a communications browser module upon a selection of the Internet print request. Thus, Tonkin fails to disclose or suggest a second module to automatically launch a communications browser module upon a selection of the Internet print request to access a server associated with a service bureau at a predefined address, as recited in claims 12 and 18.

Because Savitzky and Tonkin fail to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention, they cannot provide the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3, 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Savitzky in view of Tonkin. Claims 4, 8 and 9 are rejected as being unpatentable over

Savitzky in view of Tonkin and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,012,070 to Cheng et al. (hereinafter "Cheng"). Claim 11 is rejected as being unpatentable over Savitzky in view of U.S. Patent 5,524,085 to Bellucco et al. (hereinafter "Bellucco") and further in view of Cheng. Claims 14 and 20 are rejected as being unpatentable over Tonkin in view of Bellucco. Claims 14 and 20 are rejected as being unpatentable over Tonkin in view of Cheng. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Foremost, it is noted that claims 5 and 15 have not been rejected under the preceding paragraph. However, it appears that the Examiner inadvertently failed to assert that claims 5 and 15 are rejected, since the Examiner addresses claim 5 on page 4 of the Office Action and addresses claim 15 on page 11 of the Office Action.

As discussed above, Savitzky and Tonkin neither disclose nor suggest the claimed invention of claim 1, the independent claim from which the rejected claims depend, and thus Cheng and Bellucco fail to overcome the noted deficiencies of Savitzky and Tonkin. Thus, it is respectfully requested the rejection be withdrawn.

For at least these reasons, Savitzky, Tonkin, Cheng and Bellucco, either alone or in combination fail to disclose, teach or even suggest all of the features recited in claims 1, 3-12, 14-18 and 20-22. Thus, Savitzky, Tonkin, Cheng and Bellucco fail to anticipate or render obvious the subject matter of claims 1, 3-12, 14-18 and 20-22. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-12, 14-18 and 20-22 based on Savitzky, Tonkin, Cheng and Bellucco and the various asserted combination of these references are respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3-12, 14-18 and 20-22 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

David J. Cho
Registration No. 48,078

JAO:DXC/lrd

Date: March 12, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--

APPENDIX

Claims 2, 13 and 19 are canceled.

The following is a marked-up version of the amended claims:

1. (Amended) A method for submitting a document in electronic form to a service bureau for printing comprising the steps of:
 - receiving a print command input to a computer for printing a document stored in memory accessible to the computer; ~~and~~
 - responsive to the print command, routing the document over Internet to a service bureau for printing;
 - automatically activating a communications browser program in the computer upon selection of the print command; and
 - transmitting the document to a server associated with the service bureau.
8. (Amended) The method of claim 1, further comprising the step of displaying plural printer routing options, one of the printer routing options being ~~the~~ an Internet print shop.
12. (Amended) A computing machine comprising:
 - a computer controlled by software modules;
 - a first module to sense an Internet print request; ~~and~~
 - a second module to automatically launch a communications browser module upon a selection of the Internet print request to access a server associated with a service bureau at a predefined address, the server providing the browser with a print order form;
 - a third module to display the print order form; and
 - a fourth module to transmit print order data and a document to be printed to the server providing the browser with the print order form.

18. (Amended) A computer readable medium to control a computer and having modules stored thereon, the media comprising:

a first module to sense an Internet print request; ~~and~~

a second module to automatically launch a communications browser module upon selection of the Internet print request to access a server associated with a service bureau at a predefined address, the server providing the browser with a print order form;

a third module to display the print order form; and

a fourth module to transmit print order data and a document to be printed to the server providing the browser with the print order form.